

## REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, a copy of the PTO-Form 1449 filed with the July 12, 2004 Information Disclosure Statement is provided for the Examiner's convenience. Applicants respectfully request acknowledgement of this IDS.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,866,393). Claims 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano. These rejections are moot based on the cancellation of claims 1-5.

Claims 28, 30, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Umemoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,742,921). In response, Applicants amended claim 28 to define the light-diffusing function as being imparted to the surface of the reflection-type liquid crystal display panel on the side "adjacent to the air gap" and facing the light guide plate, and respectfully traverse the rejection as it applies to the amended claim.

As amended, claim 28 now calls for a reflection-type liquid crystal display device, as shown in, for example, FIG. 3 of the present application. A reflection-type liquid crystal display device includes a light guide plate 23 having a polarizing element 30 stuck or adhered thereto on the side facing a reflection-type liquid crystal display panel 10, the polarizing element 30 is adjacent to a predetermined air gap relative to the reflection-type liquid crystal display panel 10. A source of light 21 is arranged on an end surface side of the light guide plate 23. A light-diffusing function is imparted to the

surface of the reflection-type liquid crystal display panel 10 by a light-diffusing film 31 on the side adjacent to the air gap and facing the light guide plate 23.

In contrast, Umemoto discloses in FIG. 5 a light-diffusing layer 25 arranged on a surface of a liquid crystal display panel 20 and a polarizer 24 arranged on the light-diffusing layer 25. (See col. 17, lns. 9-55 and FIGs. 5-8 of Umemoto). Since the polarizer 24 is arranged on the light-diffusing layer 25, Umemoto fails to disclose a light-diffusing function imparted to the surface of the reflection-type liquid crystal display panel 20 on the side adjacent to the air gap and facing the light guide plate. More specifically, Umemoto fails to disclose a light-diffusing layer 25 being directly adjacent to the air gap. With respect to the anti-reflection layer 12, 112, Applicants respectfully submit that this layer is not formed on the reflection-type liquid crystal display panel 20, and therefore Umemoto fails to disclose or suggest the features of amended claim 28. Since claims 30 and 32 depend from claim 28 and include additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also in condition for allowance. For these reasons, withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection of claims 28, 30, and 32 is respectfully requested.

Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Umemoto. In response, Applicants traverse the rejection for the reasons recited above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 28.


Since claim 31 ultimately depends from claim 28, it necessarily includes all the features of its associated independent claim plus other additional features. Thus,

Applicants submit that the §103 rejection of claim 31 has also been overcome for the same reasons mentioned above to overcome the rejection of independent claim 28. Applicants respectfully request that the §103(a) rejection of claim 31 also be withdrawn. .

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By   
Joseph P. Fox  
Registration No. 41,760

November 3, 2006  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080  
Customer No. 24978